REMARKS

The rejection objects to the drawings, under CFR 1.84. As such, formal drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are submitted herein. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 37-40, 49-52 and 61-64 are rejected as being allegedly anticipated by Silverbrook et al., (U.S. 6,678,499) (hereinafter "Silverbrook"). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

Independent Claim 37 recites a limitation whereby in response to recognizing a plurality of print elements, determining the instructional response, as claimed. For example, in response to a user input, the computing device may provide the user with tips on how to solve a problem. Independent Claim 37 further recites an output device for outputting the instructional response, as claimed.

In contrast, Silverbrook discloses that for each examination, the user may be an examiner, a marker or an examinee (see Silverbrook, col. 46, lines 8-10). Silverbrook further discloses that the examinee may give an answer, e.g., an answer to a multiple choice question or essay (see Silverbrook, col. 46, lines 31-35). A written answer may be converted to text using handwriting recognition and each answer may be associated with a score and a comment (see Silverbrook, col. 46, lines 35-39). Silverbrook further discloses that a completed examination

may be printed by a marker and extra fields may be printed for essay style questions to allow the marker to enter the score and comments against the answer (see Silverbrook, col. 48, lines 3-6).

Accordingly, Silverbrook discloses that after answers are provided by the examinee, the marker may enter the score and provide comments by writing on the optional fields that are provided. As such, it is the marker that provides comments, as disclosed by Silverbrook, and not a computing device, as claimed. Thus, Silverbrook fails to teach or suggest a computing device determining the instructional response, as claimed.

As presented and discussed above, Silverbrook discloses that the examination may be printed and thereafter the marker may provide comments and scores. Thus, the output device is not outputting any instructional response, as claimed but rather outputting the exam with its answer from the user such that a marker at a later time can provide comments. As such, Silverbrook fails to either teach or suggest an output device for outputting the instructional response, as claimed.

Accordingly, Silverbrook fails to anticipate independent Claim 37, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Independent Claims 49 and 61 recite limitations similar to that of Claim 37 and are patentable for similar reasons. Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

As per Claims 40, 52 and 64, Silverbrook discloses that an infrared LED provides infrared radiation for projection onto the surface where an image sensor receives the reflected radiation from the surface (see Silverbrook, col. 39, lines 62-65). Accordingly, the image sensor receives the reflection of an image that is visible, as disclosed by Silverbrook, and not for detecting a plurality of substantially invisible codes printed on the surface, as claimed.

As such, allowance of Claims 37-40, 49-52 and 61-64 is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 41-48, 53-60 and 65-72 are rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Silverbrook in view of Nagasaki et al. (U.S. 5,896,403) (hereinafter "Nagasaki"). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

Nagasaki fails to remedy the failures of independent claims, that are presented and discussed above. Thus, Claims 41-48, 53-60 and 65-72 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Moreover, the rejection admits that Silverbrook fails to teach that the output device is an audio output device, as claimed. The rejection relies on Nagasaki. Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

As per Claims 41, 53 and 65, Nagasaki discloses that a user traces the dot code with a pen type information reproducing apparatus (see Nagasaki, col. 9, lines 62-64). Nagasaki further discloses that the dot code can be converted into a sound that a user can hear (see Nagasaki, col. 9, lines 64-66). The audio information include teaching materials for foreign languages, musical scores, texts for correspondence courses, repair manuals, language dictionaries, etc. (see Nagasaki, col. 12, lines 59-67). Accordingly, the audio information provide auditory teaching material for information that was previously encoded onto a sheet of paper during manufacturing and are not an instructional response resulting from a user input, as claimed. Thus, the auditory teaching material, as disclosed by Nagasaki, fails to either teach or suggest instructional response, as claimed, which results from processing the user input, as claimed. Moreover, as presented and discussed above, Silverbrook fails to teach or suggest an output device for outputting the instructional response, as claimed. Thus, the combination of Silverbrook and Nagasaki merely discloses outputting an auditory teach material, which differs from an audio output device for outputting instructional response, as claimed resulting from processing the user input.

As per Claims 45, 57 and 69, Silverbrook discloses that the coded data from the form is read and provides control information such that designation by the user causes instructions to be applied to a software running on the computer system (see Silverbrook, col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 2). Accordingly, Silverbrook merely discloses supplying the control information via coded data. Thus,

Silverbrook is silent as to determining a location of a plurality of print elements on the surface, as claimed.

As per Claims 48, 60 and 72, one would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Silverbrook and Nagasaki in the claimed fashion. Silverbrook explicitly teaches transmission of coded data to a computer system that is separate from the sensing device where the coded information is processed or the examination paper is printed (see Silverbrook, col. 3 line 58 to col. 4 line 2 and col. 48, lines 2-6). Accordingly, the sensing device, as disclosed by Silverbrook, is merely for detecting coded data and transmitting the coded data to a computer system where the examiner and/or marker can mark and process the exam. Thus, using a speech output device of Nagasaki does not only fail to serve a constructive purpose since it has no use for an examinee answering questions under exam condition but it would be disruptive to other examinees taking the exam. Therefore, in view of the cited art, one would not be motivated to have a writing device that comprises an output device where the writing device forms a housing, as claimed.

The rejection admits that Silverbrook further fails to teach that a task is audibly presented to the user by the audio output device, as claimed. The rejection relies on Nagasaki. Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

As per Claims 42, 54 and 66, as presented and discussed above, Nagasaki discloses providing auditory teaching material. Thus, Nagasaki merely outputs audio information that is educational in nature, e.g., teaching materials for foreign languages, musical scores, repair manuals, etc. Providing audio output that is educational in nature, as disclosed by Nagasaki, differs from a task, as claimed that asks a user to perform an action as dictated by the task. Thus, Nagasaki fails to either teach or suggest that a task is audibly presented to the user by the audio output device, as claimed. Claims 43, 47, 55, 59, 67 and 71 are patentable over the cited combination under similar rationale.

Accordingly, Silverbrook alone or in combination with Nagasaki fails to render Claims 41-48, 53-60 and 65-72 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As such, allowance of Claims 41-48, 53-60 and 65-72 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, the Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 37-72 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 37-72 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: January 24, 2008

Amir A. Tabarrok
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the USPTO via EFS on the date shown below:
January 24, 2008
Asha C. Zahrt